

☐ SECRET

☒ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/08/22 : CIA-RDP79B00873A001600040024-8

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

25X1

TO:

DATE

9 March 1970

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

4 (Final)

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

Complete

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

25X1

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Photographic & Line-Scan Imagery Experimentation

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE



YES

☐ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED 100%

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED 100%

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side)

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side)

INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT IF YES, CHECK TYPE

☐ YES

☒ NO

NOTE:

USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.

FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

☐ COST ☐ AWARD FEE ☐ PERFORMANCE ☐ DELIVERY

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

4. ☒ ABOVE AVERAGE

7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

5. ☐ AVERAGE

3. ☐ VERY GOOD

6. ☐ MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☐ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☒ CLOSE OUT

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MANUALS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FINAL REPORT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SPECIAL TOOLING		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

SI

DIVISION

IN

25X1

25X1

FORM 12-67 1897 USE PREVIOUS EDITION

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☒ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET

(12-34)

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/08/22 : CIA-RDP79B00873A001600040024-8

NARRATIVE REPORT

☐ INTERIM☒ FINAL

A final technical report entitled "A Comparison of Line-Scan and Photographic Images for Target Identification" has been received from the contractor and evaluated within RED/TSSG. The primary conclusions reached regarding the contractor's technical performance include the following:

1. Overall, the study conducted [] was a competent effort producing 25X1 results of significant value for RED, NPIC, and Community consideration. The originally-stated goals were achieved, and the required experimental design, study conduct, and data analysis subtasks were accomplished successfully.
2. The contractor's demonstrated perception of NPIC operations and procedures and his ability to work in close cooperation with other RED contractors (in this case []) proved to be significant assets in the conduct of the study. 25X1
3. Presentation of the study's final results, however, was somewhat deficient. Amplification of certain critical assumptions, experimental techniques employed, and data analysis methodologies would have significantly improved the completeness of the final document.
4. The imagery simulation techniques employed during the stimulus preparation phase of the effort could have been significantly more rigorous. The image degradation accomplished via a defocusing route and the superimposition of noise samples on the signal especially were less efficient techniques than others available for more accurate simulation of Center imagery. Modulation transfer function comparisons with operational imagery also could have been better executed.
5. An additional deficiency in the contractor's performance was his failure to specify the scheduling requirements for IEG personnel participation far enough in advance of the experimental study. Significant disruption of IEG operations occurred due to this lack of foresight which could easily have been avoided.

In summary, the contractor's technical performance on this contract is rated as ABOVE AVERAGE. Although the conceptual and analytical portions of his work were of considerably higher caliber than would be indicated by this summary assessment, his poor responsiveness to routine sponsor requirements detracted from his overall performance rating. It is felt, however, because the above problem areas have since been thoroughly discussed among contractor and RED personnel, that future similar deficiencies will not occur.

All deliverable items listed in the contract have been received.

FUNDS COMMITTED - ORIGINAL CONTRACT: [] 25X1

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☒ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET